

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-20 and 22 are pending in the case. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

Claims 1, 3-20 and 22 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Liou et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0059395). The Examiner stated essentially that Liou teaches all the limitations of Claims 1, 3-20 and 22.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "displaying an activity map comprising at least two perspectives of the environment, wherein each perspective is an abstract graphical display of at least one aspect of the user activity within the environment;... and displaying a graphic link connecting the element of the first perspective and at least one element of a second perspective and representing an association between the element of the first perspective and the at least one element of a second perspective." Claim 12 claims, "representing the aspect in an activity map including at least two perspectives of the aspect; representing an activity of a user within the environment, wherein the activity corresponds to the aspect and is represented in each perspective simultaneously; and representing the activity of the user as a line rendered between each perspective of the aspect." Claim 19 claims, *inter alia*, "displaying at least one different aspect of user activity in each of at least two perspectives of an activity map, wherein the perspectives are associated by the user activity of a market participant, wherein an association between perspectives is represented as a tangible link connecting perspectives, wherein the

tangible link is a line linking aspects of the user activity of the market participant represented separately in the at least two associated perspectives of the activity map.”

Referring to Claim 1: Liou teaches a method for providing a user interface for product exploration and product configuration (see Abstract). Liou does not teach “displaying an activity map comprising at least two perspectives of the environment, wherein each perspective is an abstract graphical display of at least one aspect of the user activity within the environment” as claimed in Claim 1. In the Response to Amendments/Arguments, at page 5, the Examiner seems to suggest that a user’s manipulation of a graphical user interface (GUI) is analogous to “an abstract graphical display of at least one aspect of the user activity within the environment.” It is clear that no activity of the user is revealed by displaying product information. Further, Liou fails to teach “an abstract graphical display of a first predefined characteristic of the user activity.” Liou teaches a literal view of product information (see for example, FIG. 1). Liou’s literal view of product information is neither an abstract view nor a view of user activity within an environment. Thus Liou fails to teach an “abstract graphical display of at least one aspect of the user activity within the environment” as claimed in Claim 1.

Further still, nowhere does Liou teach “displaying a graphic link connecting the element of the first perspective and at least one element of a second perspective and representing an association between the element of the first perspective and the at least one element of a second perspective” as claimed in Claim 1. Liou merely teaches tabs for switching between views of product information, wherein the view are “unique and independent” (see paragraph [0035]). The user interface and tabs of Liou fail to display two perspectives, much less a graphic link connecting the element of the first perspective and at least one element of a second perspective, essentially as claimed in Claim 1. Therefore, Liou fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 1.

Referring to Claim 12: Liou teaches method for providing a user interface for product exploration and product configuration (see Abstract). Liou does not teach “representing the aspect in an activity map including at least two perspectives of the aspect; representing an activity of a user within the environment, wherein the activity corresponds to the aspect and is represented in each perspective simultaneously; and representing the activity of the user as a line rendered between each perspective of the aspect” as claimed in Claim 12. Liou teaches a literal view of product information (see for example, FIG 1). Liou’s literal view of product information is not “an activity map including at least two perspectives of the aspect.” For example, Liou teaches the use of tabs to switch between individual views - no more than one window corresponding to a selected tab is displayed at any time. Further, the tabs clearly do not represent “the activity of the user as a line rendered between each perspective of the aspect” as claimed in Claim 12. Tabs reveal product information and are unrelated to displaying the activity of a user. Therefore, Liou fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 12.

Referring to Claim 19: Liou teaches method for providing a user interface for product exploration and product configuration (see Abstract). Liou does not teach “displaying at least one different aspect of user activity in each of at least two perspectives of an activity map, wherein the perspectives are associated by the user activity of a market participant, wherein an association between perspectives is represented as a tangible link connecting perspectives, wherein the tangible link is a line linking aspects of the user activity of the market participant represented separately in the at least two associated perspectives of the activity map” as claimed in Claim 19. Liou teaches a literal view of product information (see for example, FIG 1). Liou’s literal view of product information does not display a “tangible link is a line linking aspects of the user activity of the market participant represented separately in the at least two associated

perspectives of the activity map” as claimed in Claim 19. With respect to Claim 19, Liou is clearly deficient; Liou’s tabs are clearly irrelevant to a line between perspectives. Therefore, Liou fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 19.

Claims 3-11 depend from Claim 1. Claims 13-18 depend from Claim 12. Claims 20 and 22 dependent The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims.

The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including claims 1, 3-20 and 22, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner’s early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 23, 2007

/Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889